



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Am

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/774,844	01/31/2001	Curtis T. Gross	10005528-1	6269

7590 06/20/2005
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

KHOSHNOODI, NADIA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2133

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/774,844	Applicant(s) GROSS, CURTIS T.	
	Examiner Nadia Khoshnoodi	Art Unit 2133	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/25/2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendments

Drawings

The amendments made to the specification cure the deficiencies, as well as incorrect references to figure elements regarding figure 3. As such, the drawings filed on January 31, 2001 are now acceptable.

Specification

Amendments to the specification filed January 31, 2001 are acceptable.

Claim Objections

Amendments made in regards to claims 2, 16, and 23 in order to cure the prior informalities are accepted. Therefore, the prior objections are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Amendments made in regards to claims 1, 10, 15 and 18 in order to cure the prior informalities are accepted. Therefore, the prior rejection of claims 1-22 is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments/amendments with respect to amended claims 1-4, 10, 12, 15-18, 21, & 23 previously presented claims 5-9, 11, 13-14, 19-20, 22, & 24-25 and newly presented claims 26- 42 filed 11/25/2004 have been fully considered (See 37 CFR 1.111 or MPEP 714.04)

but they are not persuasive. The Examiner would like to point out that this action is made final (See MPEP 706.07a).

Applicant contends that McManis or Hong et al. do not teach the email itself including the task description. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner agrees that an email message is not explicitly stated as the packet object, however McManis teaches that the packet object's subclass could be defined as an email which could trigger, for example, creating a spreadsheet as the command (col. 5, lines 3-15), hence the email message including the task description. Furthermore, Hong et al. specifically teach many different reasons one would want to use an email message to communicate (col. 6, lines 5-12), as well as transporting email messages containing the hypertext files which contain commands (col. 3, lines 14-53), hence the email message including the task description. For these reasons, the rejection regarding claim 23 is maintained, as well as further elaborated on to address the new limitations of the amended claim.

Furthermore, the Examiner asserts that dependent claims 24-25 are not allowable based on the previous prior art rejection which is maintained.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 26-28 recite the limitation "said task descriptor" in line 1 of each of the claims. A task description has been introduced in line 5 of independent claim 23, however that task description has not been defined to have different task descriptors. Thus, there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

I. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

II. Claims 1-2, 4-9, 13-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McManis United States Patent No. 5,680,461 and further in view of Hong et al United States Patent No. 5,710,883.

As per claim 1:

McManis substantially teaches a method for sharing resources between first and second workstations separated by a segment of a public network, element 106 in figure 1, comprising the steps of transmitting an email message (fig. 1, element 110) from said first workstation (fig. 1, element 102), to said second workstation (fig. 1, element 103) separated from said first

Art Unit: 2133

workstation by at least one security measure (fig. 1, element 105) disposed within a destination computing site (fig. 1, element 104), and employing a protocol to enable said transmitted email message to penetrate said at least one security measure (col. 4, lines 16-26 and fig. 1, element 105). McManis also teaches that a client computer, i.e. the second workstation, after receiving a valid an acceptable packet object, executes the command along with its corresponding object data (col. 7, lines 24-32). Inherently in this process, there must be a determination that an executable command exists in the payload, i.e. script, of the packet in order to execute it. Furthermore, McManis teaches that the packet object's sub-class could be defined as an email which could trigger, for example, creating a spreadsheet as the command (col. 5, lines 3-15).

Not explicitly disclosed by McManis is specifically using an email message. However, Hong et al. specifically teach many different reasons one would want to use an email message to communicate these executable commands. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis to have an email message as the packet. The modification of the packet to the email message would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Hong et al. in col. 6, lines 5-12.

As per claim 2:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the method of claim 1 above. McManis further teaches a protocol in col. 4, lines 20-26. Yet even further, Hong et al. teach a Simple Mail Transfer Protocol to be used as the specific protocol in (col. 5, lines 15-24 and col. 6, lines 12-15).

As per claim 4:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the method of claim 1 above. Furthermore, McManis teaches the method where executing step comprises the step of performing an operation on data other than said transmitted message (col. 7, lines 24-36).

As per claim 5:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the method of claim 1 above. Furthermore, McManis teaches a method wherein said means for verifying an identity of said first workstation in fig. 6, element 608 and means for verifying an identity at a firewall connected to a server dedicated to a second workstation (fig. 3, element 324 and col. 6, lines 24-46). McManis fails to explicitly disclose means for verifying an identity of said first workstation at said second workstation. However, McManis does display the second workstation indirectly connected to the firewall, which is where the identity of the first workstation is verified. Therefore, it would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis to allow the second workstation to directly verify the identity of the first workstation. The modification of the firewall verifying the identity of the first workstation at the second workstation would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by McManis in fig. 2, element 224 and col. 4, lines 10-12.

As per claim 6:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the method of claim 1 above. Furthermore, McManis teaches a method where said at least one security measure is a firewall (fig. 1, element 105).

As per claim 7:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the method of claim 6 above. Furthermore, McManis teaches a method disposing said destination computing site within a controlled-access network. Although the term "controlled-access network" is not explicitly stated, element 109 in fig. 1 represents the protected side of the network thus is identical to a "controlled-access network."

As per claim 8:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the method of claim 7 above. Furthermore, McManis teaches a method disposing said firewall (fig. 1, element 105) in between said public network (fig. 1, element 106) and said controlled-access network (fig. 1, element 109).

As per claim 9:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the method of claim 7 above. Furthermore, McManis teaches a method of attaching an executable file to said message referring to col. 4, lines 48-55 wherein said executing step comprises the step of executing said attached executable file as shown in fig. 6, element 632.

As per claim 13:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the method of claim 1. McManis further teaches a method with means of automatically performing operations attached to said transmitted message as seen in fig. 6, element 632. Yet further, Hong et al. teach a method for performing an operation on a document attached to said message (col. 5, lines 35-49).

As per claim 14:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the method of claim 1 above. Furthermore, McManis teaches a means of automatically performing operations attached to said transmitted

Art Unit: 2133

message as seen in fig. 6, element 632. Yet further, Hong et al. teach a method for performing an operation on a document resident within said destination computing site (claim 9 with focus on the term "editing").

As per claim 15:

McManis substantially teaches that the unprotected client computers can also receive packets from a number of the possible workstations or the server (col. 7, line 66 – col. 8, line 4) and therefore teaches the means for transmitting an email from a first workstation of a plurality of workstations onto said public network is depicted in fig. 1, elements 103 or 104 and col. 7, line 66 – col. 8, line 4. Then, the means for enabling the transmitted email message to pass through a firewall separating said public network from a second workstation is depicted in fig. 1, element 105. Furthermore, support for a means for receiving said transmitted email message at said second workstation is in col. 7, line 66 - col. 8, line 4. As for a means for verifying an authorization of said first workstation to request execution at said second workstation, of a selected function included in the packet's payload, i.e. the email message's script, McManis teaches that the second workstation can have a built in internal firewall with the claimed capabilities (col. 8, lines 5-17). Yet further, McManis teaches a means for automatically performing said selected function at said second workstation if said authorization of said first workstation is verified (col. 8, lines 12-17). Finally, McManis teaches that the packet object's sub-class could be defined as an email which could trigger, for example, creating a spreadsheet as the command (col. 5, lines 3-15).

Not explicitly disclosed by McManis is specifically using an email message. However, Hong et al. specifically teach many different reasons one would want to use an email message to

Art Unit: 2133

communicate these executable commands. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed in McManis to have an email message as the packet. The modification of the packet to the email message would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Hong et al. in col. 6, lines 5-12.

As per claim 16:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the method of claim 15 above.

Furthermore, McManis teaches a means of automatically executing code resident on the second workstation (fig. 6, element 632). Yet further, Hong et al. teach a method for performing an operation on a document resident within said destination computing site which implies that the code execution depends on code resident in the second workstation (claim 9 with focus on the term "editing").

As per claim 17:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the system of claim 15 above. Furthermore, McManis teaches a protocol to enable communication of said message through a firewall in col. 4, lines 20-26. Even further, Hong et al. teach the use of an SMTP port (col. 5, lines 15-24 and col. 6, lines 12-15).

As per claim 18:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the system of claim 15 above. Furthermore, McManis teaches an mail server dedicated to said second workstation as depicted in fig. 1, elements 104 and 103, as well as a means for enabling communication between said dedicated mail server and said second workstation in col. 3 lines 53-58. Although the server is not

Art Unit: 2133

specifically called a mail server, it is identical to the mail server in regards to how it is defined in the applicant's specification. See fig. 6, elements 626-632.

As per claim 19:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the method of claim 1 above. Furthermore, McManis teaches the system wherein said means for verifying said authorization comprises means for generating a digital signature (see claim 2) at said first workstation (fig. 6, element 608) and means for decrypting said digital signature at a firewall connected to a server dedicated to a second workstation (fig. 3, element 324 and col. 6, lines 24-46). McManis also teaches that the second workstation can have an internal firewall (col. 8, lines 1-17).

As per claim 20:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the system of claim 15 above. Furthermore, McManis teaches the system wherein said means for automatically performing comprises means for running an executable file attached to said message (fig. 6, element 632).

As per claim 21:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the system of claim 15 above. Furthermore, McManis teaches the system where means for automatically performing comprises means for running an executable file identified in said message shown in fig. 6, element 632 and resident in said controlled-access network as depicted by element 109 in fig. 1. See col. 5, lines 3-9.

As per claim 22:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the system of claim 15 above. Furthermore, McManis teaches the system with means of automatically performing operations attached to said

message as seen in fig. 6, element 632. Even further, Hong et al. substantially teach a method for performing an operation on a document attached to said message (col. 5, lines 35-49).

As per claim 23:

McManis substantially teaches a method of a system for causing a function to be performed at a destination computing site remote from a requesting computing site in col. 2, lines 1-22. McManis also substantially teaches a packet object generator, element 212 in fig. 2, which is analogous to the applicant's email composer disposed in communication with a requesting computing site for composing a message including a task description and data authenticating said requesting computing site. See col. 4, lines 43-46.

Not explicitly disclosed by McManis is an email message. However, McManis substantially teaches the use of an email as a subclass of the type of packet. Furthermore, Hong et al. substantially teach the use of an email in fig. 3 in the second step of the box entitled "Transport Notes From Client to WWW Server." Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the method disclosed in McManis to specifically use an email message in place of the packet. The modification of the packet to the email message would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Hong et al. in col. 6, lines 5-12. Additionally, McManis substantially teaches a method for a network link for enabling transmission of said composed email message in col. 4, lines 27-34.

Not explicitly disclosed by McManis, once again, is the email message nevertheless the factors for obviousness as well as motivation are as stated previously. McManis fails to explicitly disclose a mail gateway. However, Hong et al. substantially teach a mail gateway

Art Unit: 2133

disposed in communication with said destination computing site for receiving said transmitted composed email. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify fig. 1 of McManis to incorporate a mail gateway from Hong et al. The modification of incorporating the mail gateway would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Hong et al. in col. 5, lines 31-34. McManis also substantially teaches a server dedicated to a destination computing device disposed within said destination computing site, found in protected side of the network (fig. 1, element 109), for identifying said task description in fig. 6 element 626-628.

Not explicitly disclosed by McManis is a mail server. However, McManis substantially teaches a server that ultimately carries out functions identical to that of a mail server. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the server, element 103 of fig. 1, to a mail server because it has the same functionality. The modification of the server to a mail server would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since the idea of compatibility and transmitting messages is suggested by McManis in col. 2, lines 6-10. Finally, McManis substantially teaches a means for verifying said authenticating data as depicted in fig. 6, element 620 and means for executing said described task where said authenticating data is verified in fig. 6, elements 622-632.

As per claim 24:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the system of claim 23 above. Furthermore, McManis teaches the system wherein said authenticating data includes a digital signature (claim 2).

As per claim 25:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the system of claim 23 above. Furthermore, McManis teaches the system wherein said destination computing site is coupled to a local area network as depicted by the protected side (109) of fig. 1.

As per claim 26:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the system of claim 23. Furthermore, Hong et al. teach the task description is a script having instructions to the means for executing. The task description includes executable commands therefore includes instructions for executing (col. 3, lines 14-53).

As per claim 27:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the system of claim 23. Furthermore, Hong et al. teach the task description is in the text of the email message. The task description includes executable commands and is sent in the email message (col. 3, lines 14-53).

III. Claims 3, 12, 16, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McManis United States Patent No. 5,680,461 and Hong et al United States Patent No. 5,710,883 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Tetsuro, J.P. Pub No. 2000-162926.

As per claim 3:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the method of claim 1. Not explicitly disclosed by McManis or Hong et al. is the method wherein said step of executing said command

Art Unit: 2133

causes the second workstation to perform one of printing a document attached to the email message, generating a calendar entry on the second workstation, and running a diagnostic program on said second workstation. However, Tetsuro teaches printing a document attached to the email message as the executing step. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis and Hong et al. to print a document attached to the email message as the executing step. This modification would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Tetsuro in paragraph 154.

As per claim 12:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the method of claim 1. Not explicitly disclosed by McManis or Hong et al. is the method wherein said executing step causes said second workstation to print a document attached to the email message. However, Tetsuro teaches printing a document attached to the email message as the executing step. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis and Hong et al. to print a document attached to the email message as the executing step. This modification would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Tetsuro in paragraph 154.

As per claim 16:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the system of claim 15. Not explicitly disclosed by McManis or Hong et al. is the method wherein automatically executing the executable file causes the second workstation to execute code already resident on the second

Art Unit: 2133

workstation. However, Tetsuro teaches that mechanical operations can be performed such as measuring a system, where the information is resident on the second workstation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis and Hong et al. to execute code already resident on the second workstation. This modification would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Tetsuro in paragraph 85.

As per claim 28:

McManis and Hong et al. substantially teach the system of claim 23. Not explicitly disclosed by McManis or Hong et al. is the task description having an instruction to print a document attached to the email message. However, Tetsuro teaches printing a document attached to the email message as the executing step. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis and Hong et al. to print a document attached to the email message as the executing step. This modification would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Tetsuro in paragraph 154.

IV. Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McManis United States Patent No. 5,680,461 and Hong et al United States Patent No. 5,710,883 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Tanno United States Patent No. 5,960,177.

As per claim 10:

McManis substantially teaches a method wherein said executing step performs a routine in said controlled-access network (protected side 109 of fig. 1) identified in said message in col.

Art Unit: 2133

2, lines 1-22. Not explicitly disclosed by McManis is a method wherein said executing step comprises the step of executing a routine resident in said controlled-access network identified in said message. However, Tanno substantially teaches the execution of a routine resident in said controlled-access network identified in said message. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis to incorporate a means to execute a routine resident in the controlled-access network as identified in the message. The modification of the message containing a routine to be executed that is resident in the controlled-access network would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Tanno in col. 10, lines 1-21.

As per claim 11:

McManis substantially teaches a method wherein said executing step executes a command at the second workstation in fig. 6, element 632 and col. 4, lines 10-15. Not explicitly disclosed by McManis is a method wherein said executing step running a diagnostic program at said second workstation. However, Tanno substantially teaches a method wherein said executing step running a diagnostic program at said second workstation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis to incorporate a step of running a diagnostic program at said second workstation. This modification would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Tanno in col. 10, lines 22-25.

Art Unit: 2133

V. Claims 29-30, 32-35, and 37-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McManis U.S. Patent No. 5,680,461 and further in view of Tetsuro J.P. Pub. No. 2000-162926.

As per claim 29:

McManis substantially teaches a method comprising transmitting an email from a first workstation, through a firewall, to a second workstation (fig. 1, elements 102, 105, and 103); and automatically executing, at the second workstation, the executable file attached to the email as seen in fig. 6, element 632. Not explicitly disclosed by McManis is automatically detecting, by the second workstation, if an executable file is attached to the email. However, Tetsuro teaches determining whether or not the email contains an executable file attached to it. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis to incorporate a step of automatically detecting if an executable file is attached to the email at the second workstation. This modification would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Tetsuro in paragraphs 10-11.

As per claim 30:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 29. Furthermore, Tetsuro teaches the method wherein automatically executing the executable file causes the second workstation to print a document attached to the email (par. 154).

As per claim 32:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 29. Not explicitly disclosed by McManis or Tetsuro is the method wherein automatically executing the executable

Art Unit: 2133

file causes the second workstation to print the email. However, Tetsuro teaches the method wherein automatically executing the executable file causes the second workstation to print a document attached to the email. Furthermore, Tetsuro teaches that the executable command can be contained in the body of the email. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis and Tetsuro for the executable file to print the email automatically. This modification would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Tetsuro in paragraphs 154 and 28.

As per claim 33:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 29. Not explicitly disclosed by McManis or Tetsuro is the method wherein automatically executing the executable file causes the second workstation to execute code already resident on the second workstation. However, Tetsuro teaches that mechanical operations can be performed such as measuring a system, where the information is resident on the second workstation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis and Tetsuro to execute code already resident on the second workstation. This modification would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Tetsuro in paragraph 85.

As per claim 34:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 29. Furthermore, Tetsuro teaches the method wherein automatically executing the executable file causes the second

workstation to print information on a printer, i.e. execute code at a device in communication with the second workstation (par. 154).

As per claim 35:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 29. Furthermore, Tetsuro teaches the method automatically executing the executable file causes the second workstation to execute code included as an attachment to the email (par. 10-11).

As per claim 37:

McManis substantially teaches the method comprising transmitting an email from a first workstation to a second workstation (fig. 1, elements 102, 110, 103); and if the executable instruction is present, then automatically executing, at said second workstation, the executable instruction (fig. 6, element 632). Not explicitly disclosed by McManis is automatically examining, at said second workstation, the email to determine if an executable instruction is (i) within a body of the email or (ii) within an attachment to the email. However, Tetsuro teaches that the email can be present in the body of the email or as an attachment to the email, thus it must be determined where the executable instructions reside in the email in order to execute them. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis to examine the email to determine if the executable instructions are within the body of the email or in an attachment to the email. This modification would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Tetsuro in paragraphs 10-11 and 26-28.

As per claim 38:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 37. Furthermore, Tetsuro teaches the method wherein the executable instruction is a script included within the body of the email (par. 41).

As per claim 39:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 37. Furthermore, Tetsuro teaches wherein the executable instruction instructs the second workstation to print a document (par. 154). Not explicitly disclosed by McManis or Tetsuro is printing a document to a specific printer. However, McManis teaches that one of the functions that can be performed is setting a default printer for printing purposes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis and Tetsuro to print the document to a specific printer. This modification would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by McManis, col. 7, lines 24-36.

As per claim 41:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 37. Furthermore, McManis teaches the method wherein the executable instruction instructs the second workstation to execute a routine located within a network to which the second workstation is connected (col. 7, lines 23-50).

As per claim 42:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 37. Furthermore, Tetsuro teaches the method wherein the executable instruction instructs the second workstation to print a document attached to the email (par. 154).

Claims 31 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McManis U.S. Patent No. 5,680,461 and Tetsuro, J.P. Pub. No. 2000-162926 as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of Terao U.S. Patent No. 6,389,121.

As per claim 31:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 29. Not explicitly disclosed by McManis or Tetsuro is the method wherein automatically executing the executable file causes the second workstation to print a document located within a network that is accessible to the second workstation. However, Terao teaches printing an image accessible to the second workstation when the image must be stored due to the printer being inoperable at the time the information was initially sent for printing. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis and Tetsuro to automatically execute printing a document accessible to the second workstation. This modification would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Terao in col. 9, line 56 – col. 10, line 19.

As per claim 40:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 37. Not explicitly disclosed by McManis or Tetsuro is the method wherein the executable instruction instructs the second workstation to print a document in a specific format. However, Terao teaches the print information being formatted before it is printed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis and Tetsuro to instruct the second workstation to print a document in a specific format. This

Art Unit: 2133

modification would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Terao in col. 11, lines 17-31.

VI. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McManis U.S. Patent No. 5,680,461 and Tetsuro, J.P. Pub. No. 2000-162926 as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of Tanno U.S. Patent No. 5,960,177.

As per claim 36:

McManis and Tetsuro substantially teach the method of claim 29. Furthermore, McManis teaches the method wherein said executing step performs a routine in said controlled-access network (protected side 109 of fig. 1) identified in said message in col. 2, lines 1-22. Not explicitly disclosed by McManis is a method wherein automatically executing the executable file causes the second workstation to execute a file resident within a network, the file being accessible to the second workstation but not within the second workstation. However, Tanno substantially teaches the execution of a routine resident in said controlled-access network identified in said message. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in McManis and Tetsuro to incorporate a means to execute a routine resident in the controlled-access network as identified in the message. The modification of the message containing a routine to be executed that is resident in the controlled-access network would have been obvious because a person in the art at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Tanno in col. 10, lines 1-21.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nadia Khoshnoodi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3825. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Nadia Khoshnoodi
Nadia Khoshnoodi
Examiner
Art Unit 2133
5/31/2005

NK

ALBERT DECADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100